3.10 OTHER RESOURCES AND ISSUE AREAS

This section describes existing conditions and potential impacts related to Cultural Resources (archaeological or historic resources), Noise, Public Services and Utilities, and Aesthetics.

No cultural resources are known to exist (see Section 3.10.1.1, below) in the offshore areas affected by the project, including the shell mounds area and the LA-2 ocean disposal site, so they are not further evaluated. The only onshore area analyzed is the Port of Long Beach (POLB), where dredge materials could be offloaded, transferred or disposed of. It is not expected that disposal at upland landfills or recycling facilities would affect cultural resources because it is an existing facility.

The evaluation of project-related noise impacts addresses the potential for offshore noise generated during project operations to be heard onshore, as well as noise generated onshore at the POLB to affect nearby land uses. The project would not affect noise levels at a permitted landfill or recycling facility

Evaluation of project impacts on public services and utilities considers emergency services in the vicinity of the shell mounds, as well as utilities (water, storm drains, and sewers) and public services (police, fire and emergency services, and solid waste collection) onshore at the POLB and at the ultimate disposal site.

Potential project-related aesthetic impacts offshore and onshore at the POLB are evaluated. The project would have no aesthetic impact at a permitted landfill or recycling facility.

3.10.1 Cultural Resources

3.10.1.1 Environmental Setting

Shell Mounds Sites

Previous studies have found that no cultural resources, including shipwrecks, historic structures, or prehistoric resources, are present in the vicinity of the shell mounds (California State Lands Commission 1994).

Onshore Locations

No prehistoric sites are located at the POLB, which is constructed largely on fill. The Queen Mary, Badger Avenue Bascule Bridge, Edison Power Plant, and Craig Shipbuilding are either designated historic structures or potentially eligible for such status (USACE and LAHD 1992).

3.10.1.2 Regulatory Setting

Federal Criteria

Title 36 CFR Part 800 defines effects and adverse effects on historic resources as follows:

> Section 800.9(a) Criterion of Effect: An undertaking has an effect on a historic property when the undertaking may alter characteristics of the property that may qualify it for inclusion in the National Register. For the purpose of determining effect, alteration to features of a property's location, setting, or use may be relevant depending on a property's significant characteristics and should be considered.
>
> Section 800.9(b) Criteria of Adverse Effect indicates an undertaking is considered to have an adverse effect when the effect on a historic property may diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to the following:
>
> - Physical destruction, damage, or alteration of all or part of the property;
> - Isolation of the property from or alteration of the character of the property's setting when that character contributes to the property's qualification for the National Register
> - Introduction of visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are out of character with the property or alter its setting;
> - Neglect of a property resulting in its deterioration or destruction; and
> - Transfer, lease, or sale of the property without adequate provisions to protect historic integrity.

State Criteria

State CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5 (State CEQA Guidelines, revised October 26, 1998) indicate that a project may have a significant environmental effect if it causes "substantial adverse change" in the significance of an "historical resource" or a "unique archaeological resource," as defined or referenced in State CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5[b,c] (1998). Such changes include "physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired" (State CEQA Guidelines 1998 section 15064.5[b]).

3.10.1.3 Significance Criteria

An impact on cultural resources would be considered significant if it adversely affects a resource listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), the California Register of Historical Resources, or is otherwise considered a unique or important archaeological resource under CEQA. In general, a

project may have an adverse effect on a cultural resource if the resource has integrity, would be physically damaged or altered, would be isolated from the context considered significant, or would be affected by project elements that would be out of character with the resource or its setting. Impacts also would be significant if the project would directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontologic resource or site or unique geologic feature.

3.10.1.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts

The only disturbance to the sea floor would result from actions in the immediate vicinity of the shell mounds. These are disturbed areas that are already in use and contain no cultural resources. No impacts would occur.

The transport of dredged material would not impact cultural resources, nor would disposal at the existing LA-2 site, if it were to be used. LA-2 is an existing disposal site and contains no cultural resources. Disposal of dredged material at an existing facility would not affect cultural resources, nor would handling/disposal actions at the POLB. If the dredged material were disposed of at the POLB, it could be used as construction fill for an as-yet undetermined project. Construction projects at the Port are required to undergo environmental review. Any potential impacts to cultural resources from actual construction would be evaluated at that time, and mitigation measures would be identified as needed. No excavation or other ground disturbance that could affect cultural resources would occur as a direct result of disposing dredged material from the proposed project at the POLB. If dredged material were transferred from barges to trucks at the POLB for disposal at an existing permitted facility, this would not affect cultural resources since existing facilities would be used and no new excavation or other ground disturbance would be required.

None of the Program Alternatives, or the No Project Alternative, would impact cultural resources.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

3.10.2 Noise

3.10.2.1 Environmental Setting

Shell Mounds Sites

The shell mounds are between approximately 1.5 and 2.6 nautical miles (nm) offshore. The only noise is from natural sources, such as wind and wave action, and from passing vessels.

Onshore Locations

Noise at landfills or recycling facilities is generated primarily by truck traffic and equipment use at the landfills. Noise at the POLB mainly is from bulk loading facilities, shipping container handling equipment, truck traffic, train movements, and other industrial uses such as the city of Long Beach Southeast Resource Recovery Facility, and a Southern California Edison power plant. The nearest noise sensitive receptors are residences located approximately one mile to the north of the Port. Port-generated noise is perceptible in these neighborhoods as low-level background noise (POLB 1999).

3.10.2.2 Regulatory Setting

Construction at POLB is not subject to the provisions of the city of Long Beach Health and Safety Code (Chapter 8.80, Noise), nor is construction noise regulated at offshore locations. No construction would be required at the Port of Hueneme.

Operational noise within the POLB is not subject to the noise limits of the city of Long Beach Health and Safety Code, but this code does establish an exterior noise limit of 70 dBA at the boundary of the Port's industrial complex. The noise limit is 65 dBA east of Harbor Scenic Drive, where the Queen Mary, hotels, restaurants, and similar facilities are located. The code specifies that noise generated within the Port cannot exceed these standards for a cumulative period of more than 30 minutes in any hour, or the noise standard plus 5 dB for a cumulative period of more than 15 minutes in any hour, or the noise standard plus 10 dB for a cumulative period of more than 5 minutes in any hour, or the noise standard plus 15 dB for a cumulative period of more than 1 minute in any hour, or the noise standard plus 20 dB or the maximum measured ambient, for any period of time.

3.10.2.3 Significance Criteria

The criteria used to determine the significance of noise impacts are based on the example initial study checklist in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. Significant noise impacts are defined as those that:

- Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; or
- Expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels; or
- Cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or
- Cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

3.10.2.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Program Alternative 1 (PA1): Shell Mounds and Caissons Removal and Disposal

Impacts

Noise from activities at the shell mounds would not be audible onshore. No impacts would occur.

Noise from the transport of dredged material or its disposal at LA-2 would not be audible onshore. No impacts would occur. If the dredged material were disposed of at the POLB, it would be used as construction fill for an as-yet undetermined project. As noted above, construction projects at the Port are not subject to the provisions of the city of Long Beach Noise Ordinance; moreover, noise sensitive receptors are well removed from the Port. Construction projects at the POLB are required to undergo environmental review, and any potential impacts to noise from actual construction and operation of any new facility would be evaluated at that time, and mitigation measures would be identified as needed.

If dredged material were transferred from barges to trucks at the Port, it is unlikely that the noise from this activity would be distinguishable from other similar actions that occur on a routine basis at the Port. As noted in Section 3.7.4.1, there would be approximately 167 truck trips per day for 13.5 days transporting the shell mound material out of the Port, whereas there are approximately 22,000 truck trips per day in and out of the Port (Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. 2001). Impacts would be short-term and less than significant.

Disposal of dredged material at an existing permitted facility would not affect the ambient noise levels since the number of truck trips generated would be limited to the number of trips that already are allowed under the existing operating permit for the landfill or recycling facility and which, therefore, could occur regardless of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

Program Alternative 2 (PA2): Leveling and Spreading of Shell Mounds with Caissons Removal and Disposal

Impacts

Noise from activities at the shell mounds would not be audible onshore. No impacts would occur. Onshore noise impacts would be the same as for PA1.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

Program Alternatives 3 through 6 (PA3 through PA6)

Impacts

Noise from activities at the shell mounds sites would not be audible onshore, so there would be no impact on noise.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

No Project Alternative

Impacts

The No Project Alternative would have no impact on noise.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

3.10.3 Public Services and Utilities

3.10.3.1 Environmental Setting

Shell Mounds Sites

The shell mounds sites are not served by any utilities. Pipelines that formerly connected the platforms with shore facilities have been disconnected and properly decommissioned or removed. Emergency services in the vicinity are provided by the U.S. Coast Guard and the California Office of Emergency Services.

Onshore Locations

The city of Long Beach supplies domestic water and sewer services to the POLB. Waste haulers under contract to the Port provide solid waste collection and disposal services. Police and fire protection is provided by the city of Long Beach. Storm drainage facilities are developed at each Port on a project-by-project basis. Disposal and recycling facilities are served by individual utilities and public service providers located within their geographic area.

3.10.3.2 Regulatory Setting

Public services and utilities are provided by cities, special agencies, and large private utilities. The public agencies are controlled by local governing bodies, and the private utilities are under the regulation of the California Public Utilities Commission. Regulations are generally based on local policies included in general plans, building codes, ordinances, or resolutions that establish growth-managing or growth-control standards.

3.10.3.3 Significance Criteria

The criteria used to determine the significance of an impact related to public services and utilities are based on the initial study checklist in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines.

Public Services

Significant public services impacts are defined as those that:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or
- Result in the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services including but not limited to, fire protection, police protection, schools, and parks.

Utilities

Significant utilities impacts are defined as those that:

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; or
- Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities; or
- Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities; or
- Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or require new or expanded entitlements; or
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; or
- Be served by landfill(s) with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or
- Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

3.10.3.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Program Alternative 1 (PA1): Shell Mounds and Caissons Removal and Disposal

Impacts

No impacts to utilities would occur as a result of shell mounds or structure removal since no utilities are present or required, nor would there be an impact to utilities from transporting the dredged material. Offshore accidents could require the temporary services of the U.S. Coast Guard or Office of Emergency Services, but this would not require the construction or physical alterations of governmental facilities. Impacts to public services would be less than significant. If the dredged material were disposed of at the POLB, it would be used as construction fill for an as-yet undetermined project. Construction projects at the Port are required to undergo environmental review. Any potential impacts to utilities or public services from actual construction would be evaluated at that time, and mitigation measures would be identified as needed. Disposing of the dredged material for use as fill for a construction project would not directly affect public services or utilities. If dredged material were transferred from barges to trucks at the POLB for disposal at an appropriate facility, this would not affect utilities or public services since existing Port facilities would be used.

PA1 could result in disposal of approximately 45,000 cy of dredged material at a permitted disposal site. It would be disposed of in accordance with existing permit conditions and would not exceed the landfill's permitted capacity. Disposal would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No impacts to public services or utilities would result from disposing this material at the landfill.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

Program Alternative 2 (PA2): Leveling and Spreading of Shell Mounds with Caissons Removal and Disposal

Impacts

Impacts to public utilities and services under PA2 would be similar to those identified under PA1.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

Program Alternatives 3 through 6 (PA3 through PA6)

Impacts

No impacts on either public services or utilities would result from leaving the shell mounds in place. No utilities are present or would be required, and no changes to the demand for public services would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

No Project Alternative

Impacts

The No Project Alternative would have no impact on public services and utilities.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

3.10.4 Aesthetics

3.10.4.1 Environmental Setting

Shell Mounds Sites

The shell mounds sites are between approximately 1.5 and 2.6 nm offshore in the waters of the Santa Barbara Channel. Ocean views may be considered visually sensitive.

Onshore Locations

The POLB includes the necessary elements of commercial working ports, including ship channels, wharves, terminals, open yards, cargo cranes, and the movement of ship, train and truck traffic. Waste disposal facilities contain equipment needed to transfer solid waste and may include ancillary facilities, such as recycling or composting facilities, as well. They are located in areas that have been topographically altered to permit construction of the landfill.

3.10.4.2 Regulatory Setting

Adopted plans and policies of local and state agencies provide the primary regulatory guidance regarding the maintenance of aesthetic resources in the project area. The California Coastal Act contains policies (discussed in Chapter 4) that protect the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas. The POLB Port Master Plan (POLB 1999b) guides short- and long-term development of the Port.

3.10.4.3 Significance Criteria

The criteria used to determine the significance of aesthetic impacts are based on the example initial study checklist in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. Significant aesthetic impacts are defined as those that would:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; or
- Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; or
- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or
- Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

3.10.4.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Program Alternatives 1 and 2 (PA1 and PA2)

Impacts

Offshore construction, transport, and disposal activities would be short term and well removed from any sensitive public views. Disposal of dredged material at the POLB would have a less than significant impact on aesthetic resources. The material would be used as construction fill for an as-yet undetermined project. Construction projects at the Port are required to undergo environmental review. Any potential impacts to aesthetic resources from actual construction would be evaluated at that time, and mitigation measures would be identified as needed. If dredged material were transferred from barges to trucks at the POLB for disposal at an appropriate facility, this would not affect aesthetic resources since existing Port facilities would be used. Disposal of dredged material at an existing landfill or recycling facility would not affect the aesthetic environment because such facilities would accept material up to their permitted limit regardless of the proposed project.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

Program Alternatives 3 through 6 (PA3 through PA6)

Impacts

None of these leave-in-place Program Alternatives would have an effect on aesthetics.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.

No Project Alternative

Impacts

The No Project Alternative would have no effect on aesthetics.

MITIGATION MEASURES

None proposed.